

to Select File for specific amendment.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Warner.

SENATOR WARNER: Mr. President, this is going to be very short. This is the same amendment I offered first except it would only put the dollars to permit a 2½% change January 1 if the Legislature appropriates it. Instead of \$7.8 million, it is \$3.9. I was hesitant to offer it but a number of Senators indicated to me that they would support the concept of a 2½% salary and that is what it is and you can do it or not. If you don't do it, why you have guaranteed the employees a annual increase of 2½% for the last 12 and the next 12 months.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Newell.

SENATOR NEWELL: Mr. President, I will be brief also, since Senator Warner wants to conduct this very briefly. Frankly, it is no better a proposal now than it was when it was 5%. The truth of the matter is I can support, knowing full well what it is going to do to the budget, a proposal to increase state employees salary 2½% but I think the worst game that this Legislature can play is a game of "if the money is there". It is the wrong precedent to set. What happens in the future? What happens in the future if we start this precedent? What if the money is not there? Do we then say we are not going to give state employees any salary increase? It is not in their best interest. It is not in the state's best interest and it is not the proper way to budget. It is wrong. Now I really would rather have Senator Warner offer a 2% increase in the proposal that says we are going to offer the money or a 5%, which may be too high, but the truth of the matter, that is a much fairer and more reasonable and more direct approach. My guess is, my guess is that the issue here probably will not change but this is a bad precedent. Even having this go trotting over to the Governor's Office to be vetoed, it is worse than the other proposal because the other proposal is based on what you know. I was going to rise to speak against Senator DeCamp's motion because it commits future legislatures. This is not a good way to budget. It is a bad way to budget. It ought to be objected to. It ought to be voted against and I would urge this body not to set this kind of a precedent even when you know it is not going to become law.

SENATOR LANDIS: Senator Nichol, followed by Senator Marsh.

SENATOR NICHOL: Mr. Chairman, members of the Legislature, I think we have diddled around long enough with this kind of business. It is poor business in the first place, in